

Those Who Fear the Lord:
An Elite Group Within Contemporary Orthodox Judaism

by Ira Robinson
Department of Religion
Concordia University

Of the numerous books and articles published in the last two decades on various aspects of Orthodox Jewry, nearly all have been sociological in thrust.¹ They therefore have been largely concerned with understanding "what is", without being unduly concerned with "why and how it came to be". Indeed many of these studies have been criticized for their historical naivete.² Since we are apparently dealing with a trend in scholarship, it seems important to remark that despite these studies an important dimension for the understanding of contemporary Orthodox Judaism remains relatively lacking. This dimension is concerned with the intellectual history of Orthodoxy. It is a lacuna of some importance, for Orthodox Judaism, to a greater extent than other contemporary Jewish ideologies, is based upon an "elite" intellectual tradition. Furthermore, the Orthodox community tends to give to its intellectual leadership and their predecessors not merely veneration, but also close attention.³

As one step in balancing our picture of contemporary Orthodoxy, I wrote a study entitled, "Because of Our Many Sins: the Contemporary Jewish World as Reflected in the Responsa of Moses Feinstein".⁴ In researching this paper, I read through the six volumes of Moses Feinstein's collected responsa, Igrot Moshe. I found, among many other interesting things, a recurring phenomenon which

I feel deserves greater attention than has hitherto been focussed upon it. Knowing Feinstein's reputation as one of the more lenient among prominent contemporary halakhic decisors, I was prepared for attempts, within the spirit of halakha, to adjust Torah to contemporary realities.⁵ This I found. Thus Feinstein, in dealing with the difficulties inherent in business relationships between Orthodox Jews and nonobservant Jews, remarked:

Certainly it is difficult to give a clear permission for this. However if we forbid it they will not listen to us for many commercial matters will be nullified which affect the livelihood of many Jews. [Therefore] we are obligated to search for reasons to permit [it].⁶

And, indeed, after several pages of close legal reasoning, he did. This is a clear illustration of what Blu Greenberg meant when she commented, "Where there is a rabbinic will, there is a halakhic way."⁷ However what I was not prepared for was the existence of a two-tiered system of halakhic prescriptions, one of which fulfills entirely the halakhic requirements of the situation and another, more stringent one, directed toward a group which he generally designates as: "Those who fear the Lord [yir'ei ha-shem]."

Thus, for example, the havdala ceremony, marking the end of sabbaths and festivals, may be recited sixty minutes after sunset, a time when, according to Feinstein, the stars may be said to have fully appeared. Nonetheless, Feinstein continues, it is incumbent upon "sons of Torah" and "God-Fearers" to observe an interval of seventy-two minutes prior to reciting havdala.⁸

Another example of this two-tiered system involves the issue of a separation between the sexes during worship. Feinstein

declares his preference that women will be seated in an upper balcony and hopes that God-fearing Jews will maintain this form of separation. However, he also states that the seating of women on the same level as men is halakhically acceptable, provided that a suitable partition [mehiza] is erected. With regard to the partition, once again, Feinstein has two recommendations. Those who fear the Lord must see to it that the partition be high enough to cover the women's heads, since many married women do not cover their hair. He will, however, accept a shorter partition, provided that most of the women's bodies remain out of sight. When praying in such a synagogue with a shorter partition, God-fearers must avoid looking in the direction of the women's section.⁹ Other examples could easily be provided.

Clearly we are dealing with two halakhic groupings within Orthodox Jewry: one group which is interested in knowing, and presumably fulfilling the dictates of the letter of halakha and an elite group, "Those who fear the Lord" which seeks to differentiate itself halakhically from the merely observant. This paper will concern itself with "Those Who Fear the Lord" in an attempt to elicit the meaning of the term and its significance for contemporary Orthodox Judaism.

Who are the God-fearers? It is possible to identify them within the various sub-groupings used to denote the various sectors of Orthodoxy. Thus, with Liebman, it may be possible to identify them with the "sectarian" wing of Orthodoxy vs. the "Church" wing.¹⁰ One might, likewise, call them, with Heilman, the "strictly" Orthodox vs. "Modern" Orthodox.¹¹ Other

denominations. e.g. "right" wing vs. "left" wing have been utilized.¹² None, however, really satisfies our desire to understand not merely the fact of the existence of a halakhically differentiated group within the bounds of halakhic Judaism but also the implications of this situation. It is easy to say that "Those Who Fear the Lord" are interested in a strict halakhic observance that goes beyond the "letter of the law". It is, however, considerably harder to understand why this is so. This is the task of this paper.

The first thing that needs to be done is to understand how the term "Those Who Fear the Lord" has been used historically. It occurs a number of times in the Bible. Thus, Abraham was a "God-fearing man".¹³ Joseph said "I fear the Lord".¹⁴ Jonah said "I fear the God of heaven".¹⁵ Job was also a "God-fearing man who shunned evil".¹⁶ It is clear that fear of God was, to the authors of the Biblical books, a praiseworthy trait; in general the term is used to denote righteous individuals. There are, however, instances in which "Those Who Fear the Lord" are referred to in the plural. This phrase appears several times in Psalms¹⁷ and in Malachi¹⁸. In general, however, the Biblical text provides no internal evidence which could inform us regarding the nature of these groups of "God-fearers", or whether, indeed, they were thought of at all as a distinct group of the righteous within Israelite society.

When we turn to Rabbinic literature, we find that "fear of God" or "fear of Heaven" is mentioned a number of times. And though "He who fears heaven" will, among other things,

punctilioiusly follow both interpretations of a given law when a dispute exists¹⁹, nonetheless, there is no notion of "God-Fearers" as a group. The closest concept is "Those Who Fear Sin" who in the Mishna were said to take care to give their charity secretly.²⁰ In Rabbinic literature, there is to be found a designation for an elite group within Jewry. The group, however, is not called "God-fearers", but rather "Fellows" [haverim].²¹

Moreover, in Rabbinic literature, there is a sense in which fear of God is not seen as a totally praiseworthy pursuit.

Thus Sifre on Deuteronomy states:

Act out of love, for the Torah makes a distinction between one who acts out of love and one who acts out of fear... In the former case his reward is doubled and redoubled.²²

The superiority of service of God out of love is often contrasted to the inferiority of service merely out of fear. The rabbis, then, tended to reinterpret the biblical term "God-fearer" as denoting one who actually served God out of "love". This tradition continued to medieval times. An extreme example of the negation of service through "fear" in the Sefardic tradition is Maimonides, who stated in his Hilakhot Teshuva:

Let not a man say I will observe...the Torah...[to] obtain all the blessings... or to attain life in the world to come...It is not right to serve God after this fashion for whoever does so serves Him out of fear. This is not the standard set by the prophets and sages. Those who may serve God in this way are illiterate, women, or children whom one trains to serve out of fear, till their knowledge shall have increased when they will serve out of love.²³

Another point to be emphasized is that, for the classical medieval commentators on the Hebrew Bible - both Ashkenazic and Sefardic - those Biblical passages which speak of groups of God-fearers were, in general not considered to denote an elite within Jewry. Thus Abraham Ibn Ezra interpreted "Those Who Fear the Lord" in Psalms 22, 24 to refer to "Those who fear the Lord from among the gentiles." Solomon b. Isaac (Rashi), interpreting that phrase in Psalms 66, 16, stated that it referred to proselytes, while Ibn Ezra on the same verse said that the phrase indicated "God-fearers from each and every nation".

If you wish to stretch a point, then you can say that these commentators do sometimes discern something remotely resembling a group of "God-fearers" among the Jews. In Psalms 118, 4 Rashi says that "Those who fear the Lord" are "The sons of Levi of whom was written 'Whoever is for the Lord .. to me'".²⁴ Ibn Ezra, also interprets Malachi 3,16 as referring to "the righteous". The Levites are indeed an elite group within Jewry; "the righteous" may well be such a group. The point is moot, but need not concern us overly in this context. That is because the major point that can be derived from this survey is that the term was in itself equivocal. There is however one place in medieval Judaic literature where the term appears to have some semblance

of relationship to what it means to Moses Feinstein. This document stems from an exceptional sectarian group in thirteenth century Germany - the Hasidei Ashkenaz. The major extant work of this movement, Sefer Hasidim begins as follows:

[This book] is written for those who fear God and are mindful of his name (cf. Malachi, 3,16). There is a Hasid whose heart desires, out of love for his creator, to do His will, but he is unaware of all these things [i.e. demands] - which thing to avoid and how to execute profoundly the wish of the creator.

For this reason the Sefer Hasidim was written so that all who Fear God and those returning to their Creator with an undivided heart may read it and know and understand what is incumbent upon them to do and what they must avoid.²⁵

Thus whatever the term may have meant - and we have seen that it meant several things over the ages - with the exception of Sefer Hasidim it did not seem to bestow a differing halakhic status on the bearer, for all Jews were to be punctilious observers of the Torah.

If, then, Feinstein's notion of "Those Who Fear the Lord" is neither Biblical, nor Rabbinic, nor part of the medieval Jewish mainstream, but rather must be sought in the esoteric conventicles of medieval Ashkenazic Hasidism - then we will have to seek further in Jewish history, specifically that of Ashkenazic Jewry to find what we desire. Though Hasidei Ashkenaz indeed had a certain influence on the mores of later Ashkenazic

Jewry, this influence did not, to my knowledge, extend to the notion of a specific halakhic elite of "God-Fearers" throughout Jewry - though local examples of religious elites, such as the members of the "Kloyz" in Brody in the eighteenth century, did exist, particularly among Kabbalists. They were, however local and essentially ephemeral phenomena.²⁶ For a specific case of a halakhic elite which could be said to exist throughout Jewry, we have to go (though intermediate stages may well have escaped my attention at this point) to the world of the Lithuanian yeshivot of the nineteenth century. We will have reference specifically to one of the great expositors of the ethos of those yeshivot, Rabbi Israel Meir ha-Kohen, known almost universally by the title of his first book as the Hafez Haim.²⁷ Famed as a halakhist as well as a master of aggada and homily, the Hafez Haim lived in the midst of a Russian Jewry undergoing the trauma and ferment which accompanied modernization. He stood at the head of a movement which aimed at the preservation of the traditions of Jewish life and learning, and which was based upon an institution which created a self-conscious elite. The movement was that of the Lithuanian yeshivot. The Lithuanian yeshiva movement, founded in the early nineteenth century in Volozhin, aimed at establishing a bastion for traditional Talmudic study and at opposing the inroads of modern heresies (Haskala) wherever they might be discerned.

In general Hafez Haim felt that the religious and social situation in his generation was without precedent in Jewish history. His was a generation in which so many Jews seemed to him to have betrayed the Torah upon which the existence of not

merely Israel but of the entire universe depended. His confused era, which he understood in terms of the strife and confusion foretold to be rampant in the generation just prior to the advent of the messiah, was in his eyes a battlefield between the forces of God and those of Satan or the Evil Inclination. And thus he saw the faithful armies of God in the following way of in his book for Jewish emigrants, The Dispersal of Israel:

Now, however, when so many have betrayed the Torah and he who is faithful is accounted of no wit, is a time of war when many do battle against the Torah, and seek to uproot it and the honor of God and his Torah are brought low. At such a time, he who takes strength not to depart from the way of the Torah, though in former time his service would be reckoned average, merits in a few days to be of the remnants called by the Lord and inscribed above with the title "Those Who Fear the Lord and Consider His Name".²⁸

That Hafez Haim in fact envisaged an elite group of God-fearers is likewise clear from his statement in his Homat ha-Dat (Fortress of Faith), an essay opposing Jewish educational reform in Eastern Europe:

But alas today when, because of the Yetzer Hora [Evil Inclination] the increase in flagrant departures everywhere is literally like a raging fire that seeks to destroy all that is good, it is very urgent that groups of God-fearing individuals be formed in every community to quench the sheet of fire in their midst.

...Once it was sufficient to select a few chosen individuals in each generation who with the power of their inspired words could quench the flame of passion (Alsheikh, Shlah, Maggid of Dubno). But today when, because of our many sins, fires are common everywhere, volunteers must be found in every community."²⁹

These fearers of God were in fact to do the job which was formerly done by the community rabbi:

Not too long ago it was possible for the Rabbi in the community to make all the above [educational] improvements himself. Today, however, because of our many sins, there are many communities where the rabbi cannot do all of it alone. He needs the help of the God-fearing laymen and, therefore, they too are obligated to assist him...Even if they find some people who insult them by saying "who chose these new rabbis to lead us!" It must not discourage them, because it was the same in former times.³⁰

Note here how the position of the previous religious elite in the community, symbolized by the community rabbi is undermined by the power of this new elite group which was not, as we shall see, coterminous with the entire community of the halakhicly observant.

Thus we have an elite group within the Jewish community, which, in the confused period prior to the messianic advent could serve as leaders of the forces of God in the apocalyptic battle for the soul of Israel. In this context of messianic birth pangs, Hafez Haim interpreted the Psalmists verses (118,2-4):

"Let Israel declare, "His steadfast love is eternal." Let the house of Aaron declare, "His steadfast love is eternal.". Let those who fear the Lord declare, "His steadfast love is eternal" in the following way:

For there are three classes within Israel:

- 1) The house of Israel, they are the generality of Israel;
- 2) The House of Aaron - they are the priests [the rabbis?] who teach the people the way of the Lord, Torah and commandments.
- 3) And those who fear the Lord, who tremble at His word who are higher in level than the Priests.³¹

Now if "Those Who Fear the Lord" in Hafez Haim's scheme are divided from the generality of Israel and even its "priesthood" - the rabbis - then this division almost invariably must have a halakhic dimension as most Jewish communal divisions did. It was reported that Hafez Haim:

always expressed the hope that would to Heaven he should be able to observe the pure law of the Jewish religion properly - because piety, the reverent fear of Heaven, meant to him being careful to observe all the details and minutiae of mitzvot beyond the requirements of the law.³²

Thus, presumably, "One who Fears the Lord" should observe stringencies even where the law permits a more lenient practice.

One example of how this works in the writings of Hafez Haim comes also from the Dispersed of Israel on a question of great importance to Orthodox Jews emigrating to the New World - what to do about one's beard. Having stated that it is permissible to remove hair with scissors (as opposed to a razor). Hafez Haim continues:

All this is in accordance with law, but in truth, it is proper to be heedful even with scissors, for the Kabbalists wrote that he thus tears out the conducts of holiness from above ... All the more today [when many even shave] it is an act of great merit [not to use even scissors].

There are five corners of the bears and there are many opinions therein; therefore, a God-fearing man will abide by all opinion and forbear to pass a razor over his beard altogether, even on the upper lip or beneath the throat.³³

Now, I believe, we have a decent notion with regard to the inspiration for Moses Feinstein's two-tiered halahic system. As well, we can understand better who "Those Who Fear the Lord" think they are:

1. They are leaders of Jewry, loyal to God in the climactic battle with the forces of evil [as well as non-Godfearing Jews] at the End of Days;
2. They are ideologically attached to the Yeshiva movement which began in 19th century Lithuania, and which has been transplanted to North America, England and Israel.
3. They are committed to a higher level of halakhic

observance than the generality of Israel (who observe halakha).

This understanding of who "Those Who Fear the Lord" are, I submit, has important implications for our understanding of Orthodox Judaism, both historically and in the contemporary period.

First of all, there are implications for that group within Orthodoxy which "Those Who Fear the Lord" does not claim as its own. These halakhically observant people are popularly known as "Modern" Orthodox, a term which can imply an openness to the modern world as well as a "newness" to the scene.³⁴ In fact, despite several scholars to the contrary, liberal Orthodoxy emerged as a Judaic option at about the same period as that of "Those Who Fear the Lord". In the Eastern European context, liberal Orthodoxy was represented by moderate elements within the haskala. Leaders of this tendency such as S.J. Rappoport of Prague remained halakhically observant while being intellectually aware of, and influenced by surrounding European culture.³⁵ It need hardly be said that Maskilim, moderate or not, were and are the bane of "Those Who Fear the Lord". The Hafez Haim's Homat ha-Dat for instance, was written to combat a curriculum introduced in Eastern Europe which would replace learning of Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary in elementary education with what Hafez Haim execrates as "methods". It is not specified in Hafez Haim's diatribe whether the evil men who were set to destroy the Torah by their educational innovations were or were not halakhically observant. In between the lines, however, it is possible to

discern that many of them doubtless were.³⁶

This brings home an important point. In seeking to distance themselves from a "modernity" which they believed to be detrimental to Daas Torah, the Torah Weltanschaung with which they were identified, they had to distinguish themselves from those "others". Thus mere halakhic observance, though a necessary minimum to be sure, is not enough to make a "God-fearer". On the contrary, tests of ideological purity with regard to Daas Torah, as well as a more stringent observance of the minutiae of halakha are of the essence.

Thus, Feinstein commented in an interview:

Those who maintained: "what do they (the Talmidei Hakhhamim) know about politics? This is a field where we are better versed" - groups that set their policies in such a manner cannot be considered as being in the Torah camp.

One might well say that ignoring the advice of the Talmidei Hakhhamim is far worse than transgressing a Law (clearly expressed in the Torah). Whereas one may violate a command because he finds himself too weak to resist the insistent attractions of that which is wrong, at least he realizes that his action is wrong. By contrast, when one does not heed the advice of a Talmid Hakham he denies the superior wisdom of the Torah personality. This is a far more serious breach.³⁷

Moreover, Feinstein recognizes that there are people "observant of the Torah" who nonetheless adopt practices which

"God Fearers" might consider detrimental to proper Jewish life. A case in point concerns a woman who wished to convert to Judaism but did not wish to adopt the "modest" style of female clothing characteristic of God-fearing Orthodox women. Feinstein forbade her acceptance and then attempted to understand her attitude in the following way.

Since, because of our many sins, the wearing of indecent (perizut) garments has also spread among the daughters of Israel, even among those who observe the Torah (my italics). Therefore, the gentile woman who has come to convert assumes that this is merely another stringency the rabbis wish to place on her over and above the law since she knows women whom she believes to be observers of the religion who dress indecently and even if the rabbis say to her that it is a forbidden matter she does not believe them.³⁸

It seems clear that the differentiation Feinstein makes between those merely observant of the Torah and "Those Who Fear the Lord" is symptomatic of something quite basic to our understanding of the dynamics of contemporary Orthodoxy. In a trenchant critique of contemporary yeshivot, Elezer Berkovitz states:

...to divide the [Jewish] people into a religious elite, exclusively dedicated to Torah study, and a professional majority, rather ignorant of Torah, incarcerates students of Torah into another form of Diaspora Museum, that of the present-day Yeshivot.³⁹

To my mind, Berkovitz has overstated his case, for "Those Who Fear the Lord" are not in practice exclusively dedicated to Torah study nor are those outside the world of the Yeshivot entirely ignorant of Torah. Where he is essentially correct, however, concerns his statement that the Yeshivot and their supporters, "Those Who Fear the Lord" have consciously set themselves up as an elite separate both halakhically and ideologically not merely from the great masses of Jews who have abandoned or modified halakha, but also from those observant of the commandments who do not share their world-view.

All this, finally must be understood in the context that those "God Fearers" for whom Feinstein writes truly believe that the world is presently undergoing the "birthpangs" of the messiah and that they are indeed the chosen few of whom God spoke through the words of Malachi.⁴⁰

Hafez Haim explains Malachi's words thus:

"Then conversed those that fear the Lord one to another, and the Lord listened and heard it, and there was written a book of remembrance before Him for those who fear the Lord and for those who respect His Name".

This prophecy refers to that period immediately before the coming of the Messiah, when the evildoers will find arguments like those mentioned above [concerning the "success" of the "desrators"]. But before the Messiah comes, we know from Scripture (Zechariah 13), that Israel will be tried with tremendous tests, as it says, "And I will refine them as one refines silver, and I will test them as gold is

tested..." In other words, they will be tested to determine if they truly embrace the Lord their God, as the passage there concludes.

Now, when men must be tested to learn if they truly love God and His Torah with all their heart He allows those who have forsaken His ways to become very successful, and in this way the servants of God are tried. If they serve the Lord sincerely they will disregard that "success". However, if they, God forbid, have the slightest doubts about their service this grand vision of evil will turn them also from the way of God.

Thus the passage reads, "They conversed," i.e., [immediately prior to the Redemption] they will discuss amongst themselves that because their age is one wherein men are tested no attention must be paid to the other's success. On the contrary, just because of it they must do their utmost to give even more honor to His Name.⁴¹

NOTES

1. Major studies include Charles Liebman, "Orthodoxy in American Jewish Life". Aspects of the Religious Behavior of American Jews (New York, 1974); Samuel Heilman. Synagogue Life: A Study in Symbolic Interaction (Chicago, 1976); idem., The People of the Book (Chicago, 1983); William B. Helmreich, The World of the Yeshiva (New York, 1982). The opposite conclusion, that, "rarely does one find a sociological description of the [North American Jewish] movements" may be found in J. Lightstone. "The Traditional Legitimation of Change: the Responsa Literature of Conservative Judaism", unpublished paper, p. 1.
2. Cf. especially the review of Helmreich by Charles Liebman, AJS Review 9(1984) pp. 137-140.
3. An exception to this general rule is Alan Nadler, "Piety and Politics: the Case of the Satmar Rebbe". Judaism 31 (1982) pp. 135-152. Cf. also David Ellenson, "The Development of Orthodox Attitudes to Conversion in the Modern Period", Conservative Judaism 36 (1983) pp. 57-73.
4. This article has been accepted for publication by Judaism.
5. Cf. Liebman, "Orthodoxy", p. 176.
6. Moses Feinstein, Igrot Moshe, Orah Haim 2, no. 62.
7. Blu Greenberg. On Women and Judaism: The View From Tradition (Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1982) p. 129.
8. Feinstein, Igrot Moshe, Orah Haim 4, no. 62.
9. Ibid. Orah Haim 1, nos. 39, 42; Orah Haim 2, no. 43; Orah Haim 4, no. 29.
10. Liebman. "Orthodoxy", p. 157 FF. Cf. Idem. "Religion and

the Chaos of Modernity: the Case of Contemporary Judaism". Take Judaism For Example, ed. J. Neusner (Chicago, 1983) pp. 147-164.

11. Heilman, World of the Yeshiva, p. 52 ff.

12. Cf. Robert Gordis, "The Varieties of American Orthodoxy" Sh'ma, 13/259 (10/14/83) pp. 133-135.

13. Genesis 22, 12.

14. Genesis 42, 18.

15. Jonah 1, 9.

16. Job 1, 8; 2, 3.

17. Psalms, 15, 4; 22, 24; 66, 16; 115, 11, 13; 118, 4; 135, 20.

18. Malachi 3, 16.

19. cf. Talmud Bavli, Berakhot 39b; Shabbat 61a.

20. Mishna, Shekalim 5, 6. cf. Ephraim Urbach, Hazal: Emunot ve-Deot (Jerusalem, 1971) p. 366.

21. Cf. Talmud Bavli, Bekhorot 30b; cf. Jacob Neusner, Fellowship in Judaism (London, Valentine, Mitchell, 1963) pp. 22-30.

22. Sifre, Deuteronomy 32 ed. L. Finkelstein (New York, 1969) p. 54.

23. Moses b. Maimon, Mishneh Torah, Hilkhot Teshuva 10, 1.

24. Cf. Exodus 32, 26.

25. Sefer Hasidim, Bologna edition. Cited in Haym Soloveitchik, "Three Themes in Sefer Hasidim", AJS Review 1 (1976) p. 312.

26. Cf. Simon Dubnow, Toldot ha-Hasidut (Tel-Aviv, Dvir, 1975) p. 118 ff; Bernard Weinryb, The Jews of Poland (Philadelphia, JPS, 1972) p. 286.

27. The standard biography on ha-Kohen to date is M.M. Yoshor.

Dos Lebn and Shafn Fun Hofez Haim. 3 volumes 3rd ed. (Jerusalem, 1969). It has recently been translated into English as Chafez Chaim 2 volumes. (New York, Artscroll, 1984). Though it contains many valuable insights, it is essentially an uncritical hagiography. Another work, in its way just as uncritical, is Lester Samuel Eckman, Revered by All; the Life and Works of Israel Meir Kagan -Hafets Haim (New York, Shengold, 1974).

28. Ha-Kohen, The Dispersed of Israel (New York, 1951) p. 34. On the messianic role of the God-fearing community, cf. Yehuda Liebes, "The Ultra-Orthodox Community and the Dead Sea Sect" [Hebrew], Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought 3 (1982) pp. 137-152.

29. Ha-Kohen, The Fortress of Faith (New York, 5724 [1965]) p. 26. It is reasonable to assume that Ha-Kohen supported the religio-political movement Agudat Yisrael largely because it represented to him just such a group. Cf. Yoshor, Chafetz Chaim. pp. 409-410.

30. Ha-Kohen, Fortress of Faith p. 86.

31. Ha-Kohen, Kuntres Zekhor le-Miryam (New York, 1960). pp. 30-31.

32. Yoshor, Chafez Haim. p. 365.

33. Ha-Kohen, Dispersed of Israel. pp. 324-325.

34. It is assumed by many that "modern" Orthodoxy is a specifically North American phenomenon with no basis in Eastern Europe. Cf. Gordis, "Halakhic Innovation in Modern Orthodoxy?" Sh'ma 14/263 (12/9/83) p. 21 and Janet Aviad, Return to Judaism: Religious Renewal in Israel (Chicago, 1983) p. 57. For a dissenting view, see Joseph Wanefsky, Rabbi Isaac Jacob Reines:

His Life and Thought (New York, Philosophical Library, 1970)
pp. 1-2.

35. On the Eastern European Haskala in general, see Jacob Raisin, The Haskala Movement in Russia (Philadelphia, 1913). Michael Stanislawski, in his Tsar Nicholas I and the Jews: the Transformation of Jewish Society in Russia, 1825-1855 (Philadelphia, 1983), discusses the beginnings of haskala in nineteenth century Russia and remarks, "It is often quite impossible to differentiate in the early years of the nineteenth century between a traditionalist of the Lithuanian school and a maskil" (p. 51).

36. Ha-Kohen, Fortress of Faith, pp. 58 ff. For the nature of halakhic Observance on the part of "maskilic" educators in late nineteenth century Jerusalem, see Menahem Gerlitz, The Heavenly City (Jerusalem, Feldheim, 1979) p.79 ff. Cf. also David Ellenson, "Church-Sect Theory, Religious Authority, and Modern Jewish Orthodoxy: A Case Study". Approaches to Modern Judaism ed H.L. Raphael (Chico, CA, Scholars Press, 1983) p. 74.

37. Cited in Helmreich, World of the Yeshiva, p. 68. On the development of the concept of Daas Torah, cf. Gershon C. Bacon, "Daat Torah and the Birthpangs of the Messiah" [Hebrew], Tarbiz 52 (1983) pp. 497-508.

38. Feinstein, Igrot Moshe, Yoreh Deah 3, no. 106/1; of Even ha-Ezer 1, no. 114.

39. Eliezer Berkovits, Not in Heaven: the Nature and Function of Halakha (New York, KTAV, 1983) p. 93.

40. For the messianic interpretation of contemporary history by

the Yeshiva movement, see Elchanan Wasserman, Ma'amar Ikvese de-Meshiha (New York, 1937). cf. Moshe Amon, "Jewish Law in Israel Today: A Conundrum For Messianic Times" Studies in Religion 13 (1984) pp. 57-63.

41. Ha-Kohen, Fortress of Faith, pp. 61-62.